

REMARKS

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected over Gundlach. This rejection is in error, because Gundlach fails to disclose or suggest several limitations of claim 1. These include: adhering a module component to a substrate with an **adhesive that can be ablated by light**, and then **ablating the adhesive** by illuminating it. The purpose is to **remove the module from the substrate** in order to **allow reuse of the substrate**.

Gundlach, in contrast, lacks all of these features. Specifically, Gundlach suggests neither an **adhesive that can be ablated** by light as claimed, nor the step of **ablating** an adhesive as claimed. Gundlach's modules are not **removed** from the substrate as claimed, but instead permanently attached. Nor does Gundlach suggest allowing **reuse** of the carrier substrate as claimed.

Therefore, on several grounds, claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 2-31

The remaining claims all depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited prior art as explained above. The limitations that the dependent claims add to claim 1 distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitchell Rose

Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 10/10/07